

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
AT WELLINGTON**

**I TE KŌTI-Ā-ROHE  
KI TE WHANGANUI-A-TARA**

**[2022] NZACC 116      ACR 126/20**

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| UNDER            | THE ACCIDENT COMPENSATION ACT<br>2001              |
| IN THE MATTER OF | AN APPEAL UNDER SECTION 149 OF<br>THE ACT          |
| BETWEEN          | JULIANNE JOHNSON<br>Appellant                      |
| AND              | ACCIDENT COMPENSATION<br>CORPORATION<br>Respondent |

Judgment on the papers.

Submissions:    The Appellant is self-represented  
                      S Churstain for the Respondent

Date of Judgment: 15 June 2022

---

**JUDGMENT OF JUDGE P R SPILLER  
[Late filing of an appeal to the District Court –  
s 151, Accident Compensation Act 2001]**

---

**Introduction**

[1]    The appeal in the above matter was lodged by Ms Johnson on 16 June 2020. The appeal is from the decision of a Reviewer dated 14 May 2020. The Reviewer dismissed an application for review of the Corporation’s decision of 6 September 2019 revoking cover for mental injury and revoking deemed cover for a spinal cord injury.

[2]    On 10 June 2022, the Registry noted that Ms Johnson’s appeal had been lodged out of time, and requested that Ms Johnson, by 16 June 2022, apply for leave to file the appeal out of time and set out the reasons why the appeal was filed late.

[3] On 10 June 2022, Ms Johnson submitted that she had understood that she had filed her appeal on time and the appeal had been accepted by the Court. She stated that any delay was never intentional, and she apologised to the Court. She noted that the appeal was very important to her.

[4] On 14 June 2022, Ms Churstain for the Corporation submitted that, given the length of the delay, the Corporation did not oppose the late filing of the appeal.

### **Relevant law**

[5] Section 151 of the Accident Compensation Act 2001 (the Act) provides:

- (1) An appellant brings an appeal by sending a notice of appeal to, or filing a notice of appeal in, a specified registry.
- ...
- (3) The notice must be received by the specified registry—
  - (a) within 28 days after the date on which the reviewer gives a copy of the review decision to the appellant; or
  - (b) ...
  - (c) within any longer time allowed by the District Court.

[6] In *Almond v Read*,<sup>1</sup> Arnold J (for the Supreme Court) outlined the following principles to guide the exercise of the discretion to grant or deny an extension of time to lodge an appeal:

[37] Accordingly, where a litigant takes steps to exercise the right of appeal within the required timeframe (including advising the other party), but misses the specified time limit by a day or so as a result of an error or miscalculation (especially by a legal adviser) and applies for an extension of time promptly on learning of the error, we do not think it is appropriate to characterise the giving of an extension of time as the granting of an indulgence which necessarily entitles the court to look closely at the merits of the proposed appeal. In reality, there has simply been a minor slip-up in the exercise of a right. An application for an extension of time in such a case should generally be dealt with on that basis, with the result that an extension of time should generally be granted, desirably without opposition from the respondent.

[38] The ultimate question when considering the exercise of the discretion to extend time under r 29A is what the interests of justice require. That necessitates an assessment of the particular circumstances of the case. Factors which are likely to require consideration include:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Almond v Read* [2017] NZSC 80, [2017] 1 NZLR 801, (2017) 23 PRNZ 533.

- (a) *The length of the delay.* Clearly, the time period between the expiry of the appeal date and the filing of the application to extend time is relevant. But in a case where there has been a slip-up and the appeal date has been inadvertently missed, how quickly the applicant sought to rectify the mistake after learning of it will also be relevant. Obviously, the longer the delay, the more the applicant will be seeking an “indulgence” from the court and the stronger the case for an extension will need to be.
- (b) *The reasons for the delay.* It will be particularly relevant to know whether the delay resulted from a deliberate decision not to proceed followed by a change of mind, from indecision, or from error or inadvertence. If from a change of mind or from indecision, there is less justification for an extension than where the delay results from error or inadvertence, particularly if understandable.
- (c) *The conduct of the parties, particularly of the applicant.* For example, a history of non-cooperation and/or delay by an applicant may be relevant.
- (d) *Any prejudice or hardship to the respondent or to others with a legitimate interest in the outcome.* Again, the greater the prejudice, the stronger the case will have to be to justify the grant of an extension of time. Where there is significant delay coupled with significant prejudice, then it may well be appropriate to refuse leave even though the appeal appears to be strongly arguable.
- (e) *The significance of the issues raised by the proposed appeal, both to the parties and more generally.* If there is a public interest in the issues, the case for an extension is likely to be stronger than if there is no such interest.

## Discussion

[7] In terms of section 151(3)(a) of the Act, Ms Johnson was required to file a Notice of Appeal against the Reviewer’s decision within 28 days after the date on which the Reviewer provided a copy of the review decision to her. The Reviewer’s decision was dated 14 May 2020, which left a date of 11 June 2020 for the filing of the Notice of Appeal. In the event, the Notice of Appeal was filed on 16 June 2020. This Court is now being asked to exercise its discretion to allow a longer time for filing the Notice of Appeal (in terms of section 151(3)(c)). In deciding whether to exercise its discretion, this Court will follow the guidelines provided by the Supreme Court in *Almond v Read*.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Above, note 1.

**(a) *The length of the delay***

[8] The Supreme Court noted that the longer the delay, the more the applicant will be seeking an indulgence from the Court and the stronger the case for an extension would need to be; and that, in a case where there had been a slip-up and the appeal date had been inadvertently missed, how quickly the applicant sought to rectify the mistake after learning of it would also be relevant.

[9] This Court notes that the delay in this case is five days, which is not a significant delay.

**(b) *The reasons for the delay***

[10] The Supreme Court noted that, if the delay arose from a change of mind or from indecision, there was less justification for an extension than where the delay resulted from error or inadvertence, particularly if understandable.

[11] Ms Johnson submitted that she had understood that she had filed her appeal on time and the appeal had been accepted by the Court. She stated that any delay was never intentional and she apologised to the Court. She noted that the appeal was very important to her.

[12] This Court acknowledges that earlier notice should have been given to Ms Johnson as to the need to file an application for leave to appeal out of time. The Court is satisfied that Ms Johnson's delay arose out of error or inadvertence.

**(c) *The conduct of the parties***

[13] The Supreme Court observed that a history of non-cooperation and/or delay by an applicant might be relevant.

[14] This Court notes that Ms Johnson complied with the Court's request to file an application for leave to appeal out of time, within the deadline specified. The Court is not aware of any history of non-cooperation and/or delay by Ms Johnson.

***(d) Prejudice or hardship to the respondent or to others with a legitimate interest in the outcome***

[15] The Supreme Court noted that, where there is significant delay coupled with significant prejudice, then it might well be appropriate to refuse leave even though the appeal appeared to be strongly arguable.

[16] This Court notes that the delay in this case is not significant. The Corporation has confirmed that it does not oppose the late filing of the appeal. The Court is not aware of any prejudice or hardship to others with a legitimate interest in the outcome of the present appeal.

***(e) The significance of the issues raised by the proposed appeal, both to the parties and more generally***

[17] The Supreme Court observed that, if there is a public interest in the issues, the case for an extension is likely to be stronger than if there is no such interest.

[18] This Court accepts that the proposed appeal is significant to Ms Johnson. The Court is not in a position to assess the significance of the issues raised by the proposed appeal more generally.

**The Decision**

[19] In light of the above considerations, this Court finds that Ms Johnson has established that the interests of justice require the exercise of the Court's discretion to sustain her application for leave to file her appeal out of time, which is accordingly granted.

[20] There are no issues as to costs.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'P R Spiller', is written over a faint, circular official stamp.

P R Spiller  
District Court Judge